

2005–06 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Calculation Outline for Elementary/Middle/High Schools, Districts, and South Carolina as of August 24, 2006

Table of Contents

Preliminary Notes	1
Reference	1
Major Changes for This Year	2
Groups for AYP Calculations	2
More on the Compliance Index.....	4
Definition of Full Academic Year for Performance Objectives	4
Operational Definition of Continuous Enrollment	4
Annual Measurable Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14.....	5
How Annual Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14 Were Set.....	5
Student Performance	6
Students with Disabilities	9
Student Participation	10
Group Size	10
Other Indicator: Attendance Rate for Elementary/Middle Schools or Graduation Rate for High Schools.....	11
Minimum Group Size for Reporting and Accountability Purposes.....	12
Note Regarding the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) Adjustment.....	13
PACT, HSAP, and HSAP-Alt Scores	14
Note Regarding PACT Off-Grade Level Testing Determination	15
Note Regarding Rounding Off Numbers	15

Preliminary Notes

- Unless otherwise noted, the descriptions provided apply to the elementary/middle/high school, district, and state AYP calculations.
- HSAP performance levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 correspond to PACT performance levels below basic (BB), basic (B), proficient (P), and advanced (A).
- References to three-year means use 2003–04, 2004–05, and 2005–06 data.
- References to two-year means use 2004–05 and 2005–06 data.

Reference

This calculation outline is not designed to replace South Carolina’s *No Child Left Behind* accountability workbook but is designed to facilitate the understanding of the process used for AYP determinations. Please consult the workbook for full details.

South Carolina Accountability Workbook (SCAW): Revised July 7, 2006

Major Changes for This Year

The Federal Government approved the following changes that apply to both the elementary/middle school- and district-level calculations:

1. Off-Grade-Level Tests: Students taking off-level tests were counted as NOT TESTED for participation and any scores from such tests were set to missing and excluded from the performance calculations. Although PACT off-grade-level tests were administered in spring 2006, the change is in anticipation of off-grade-level testing no longer being offered starting in spring 2007. This is because the U.S. Department of Education has stated that an off-grade- level test is not a valid assessment, therefore, a student taking such a test was not considered as tested for participation and did not have scores included for performance. As a result, a participation rate could decrease if many off-grade-level tests were administered and the school/district/state may not make AYP because of failure to meet the participation objective. This change did not affect the 2004–05 off-grade level test scores, which were used in the calculation of percentages and performance indexes for that school year and were included in the AYP determinations according to the 2004–05 Accountability Workbook.
2. Student Attendance Rates for Elementary/Middle Schools, Districts, and South Carolina: For Option 1, the attendance rate now needs to meet or exceed 94.0% instead of 95.3%.
3. Student Attendance Rates for Elementary/Middle Schools, Districts, and South Carolina: For Option 2, the 2005–06 attendance rate (expressed as a percentage) should be at least .1 higher than the 2004–05 attendance rate. Unlike in 2004–05, there is **no** provision for a three-year mean attendance rate in 2005–06.
4. The attendance rates for all student groups were based on 180th day data and exclude pre-kindergarten data..

Groups for AYP Calculations

Critical Element 3.2 (SCAW, pp. 23-25)

The compliance index is equal to the number of objectives met divided by the total number of objectives. If the compliance index is 100% then the school/district/state has met AYP.

Nine groups of students were used to determine AYP. The groups were determined using demographic data from the first day of testing data.

- All students
- White (coded as W in the SASI ethnicity field)
- African-American (coded as B, BI, or WB in the SASI ethnicity field)
- Asian/Pacific Islander (coded as P, A, or WA in the SASI ethnicity field)
- Hispanic (coded as H in the SASI ethnicity field)
- American Indian/Alaskan (coded as I or WI in the SASI ethnicity field)
- Disabled (coded as having a disability among the SASI EFA codes)
- LEP (coded as 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in the SASI LEP field)
- Free/Reduced (Subsidized) Meal (coded as F or R in the SASI free/reduced meals program field)

A first-year-LEP student in the U.S. for the 2005–06 school year is defined as an LEP student who enrolled in a U.S. school for the first time **after May 20, 2005**. This definition includes Puerto Ricans transferring to U.S. mainland schools during their first year. (Note: Puerto Ricans are U.S. Citizens.) The LEP student was determined by using the U.S. school date entry field in SASI. May 21, 2005 (enrollment **after May 20, 2005**) is considered the earliest entry-into-U.S.-schools date for the first year in U.S. schools exemption for the 2005–06 school year. (Note: **May 20, 2005** is the last school day of one or more South Carolina school districts that first ends its 2004–05 school year.)

Such students were given LEP flexibility and counted for participation in ELA. If they took math, they were counted for participation in math also. They were not counted for performance in both ELA and math. However, students who were excused in the “not tested” report were excluded from the AYP calculations. If the student was in the not tested report but had test scores, the test scores were still included in the AYP data processing.

Types of Objective for Each Group:

- **PERFORMANCE:** Each subgroup met the annual measurable objectives.
- **PARTICIPATION:** Each subgroup had at least 95% students tested.
- **OTHER INDICATOR:** The school/district/state met the requirement for other academic indicators (i.e., student attendance or graduation rate). This only applies to the group of all students.

Subgroups whose results were reported but did not count towards AYP. The groups were determined using demographic data from the first day of testing data.

- Male (coded as M in the SASI gender field)
- Female (coded as F in the SASI gender field)
- Not disabled (not coded as having a disability among the SASI EFA codes)
- Migrant (coded as X in migrant status field)
- Non-migrant (not coded as X in migrant status field)
- Non-LEP (not coded as 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in the SASI LEP field)
- Full-Pay Meals (coded as N in the SASI free/reduced meals program field)

The SASI LEP field was significantly expanded for the 2005–06 school year. For your reference, its codes are provided below.

Code blank	SASI Dropdown List Description Select a value	Full Description
0	Parent Waiver	Student requires ESOL services but is not receiving them based on parent refusal.
1	Pre-functional	ELDA Level 1
2	Beginner	ELDA Level 2
3	Intermediate	ELDA Level 3
4	Advanced	ELDA Level 4
5	Full English Proficient	ELDA Level 5 (Full English Proficient—FEP)
7	Title III Exited	Has scored ELDA FEP three years consecutively. Monitored for two years.
8	English Speaker I	Has scored proficient once in math and ELA on PACT/HSAF. Former LEP student.
9	English Speaker II	Student is a native English speaker.

More on the Compliance Index

The compliance index is equal to the number of objectives met divided by the total number of objectives. If the compliance index is 100% then the school/district/state has met AYP.

ONE objective is associated with the *Other Indicator* (Attendance/Graduation Rate for the *all students* group). Another THIRTY-SIX ($9 \times 2 \times 2 = 36$) objectives are counted as they involve the nine groups, two subjects, and two objectives. The latter only holds if all nine groups meet minimum sample size requirements for performance and participation.

Group	Number of Objectives			
	ELA		Math	
	Perfor- mance	Partici- pation	Perfor- mance	Partici- pation
All students	1	1	1	1
White	1	1	1	1
African-American	1	1	1	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	1	1	1
Hispanic	1	1	1	1
American Indian/Alaskan	1	1	1	1
Disabled	1	1	1	1
LEP	1	1	1	1
Free/Reduced (Subsidized) Meal	1	1	1	1

If, for example, one or more subgroups does not meet the minimum group size requirements in performance and/or participation, then the maximum number of objectives cannot be 37. Simply subtract from 37 the number of objectives not taken into account because of failure to meet the minimum group size requirements.

Definition of Full Academic Year for Performance Objectives

Critical Element 2.2 (SCAW, p. 20)

- School AYP performance is based on continuous enrollment from the 45th day through the first day of testing.
- District AYP performance is based on continuous enrollment in a district from the 45th day through the first day of testing even if there was a change in schools.
- State AYP performance is based on continuous enrollment in the state from the 45th day through the first day of testing even if there was a change in districts.

Operational Definition of Continuous Enrollment

- For the 2003–04 school year, the Office of Research used the SDEtemp1 field to determine if students were continuously enrolled in a school. There is evidence that not all of the schools and districts were able to follow the correct procedure for populating the SDEtemp1 field that year. As a result and for the 2004–05 school year, the Office of Research determined continuous

enrollment by collecting the student's most recent enrollment date in the school he/she is enrolled in during the first day of testing. The first day of testing data were matched with the 45th day of enrollment data. If the schools for matched records were the same, the record was included for AYP and report card purposes provided the most current enrollment date occurred on or before the 45th day enrollment date for the district involved. If at any time a student was not continuously enrolled in a school since the 45th day, then the latest enrollment date went past the district's 45th day date.

- In the 2005-06 first-day-of-testing data extraction, the student's enter date was transmitted to the SDE. If the enter date was greater than the district's 45th day of instruction, then the student was not continuously enrolled in the school from the 45th day. For district enrollment, the default was to assign the same status as that for the school. Districts were able to correct the district values during the June review period. If a student was enrolled in a South Carolina school as of the 45th day and remained enrolled in a South Carolina school during the first day of testing, then the student was continuously enrolled in the state. This is regardless of whether or not the student moved to another school or whether or not the student moved to another district with a different school year calendar.

Annual Measurable Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14

Critical Element 3.1 (SCAW, p. 22) and Attachment B (SCAW, pp. 66-68)

Last school year's objectives are shown for comparison to this school year's objectives.

Options 1 and 2

School Year	ES & MS		HS		District/State	
	ELA Obj.	Math Obj.	ELA Obj.	Math Obj.	ELA Obj.	Math Obj.
2004–05	38.2	36.7	33.3	30.0	24.0	19.9
2005–06	38.2	36.7	52.3	50.0	45.8	42.7

Safe Harbor 2

School Year	ES & MS		HS		District/State	
	ELA Obj.	Math Obj.	ELA Obj.	Math Obj.	ELA Obj.	Math Obj.
2004–05	68.3	68.5	80.2	73.0	79.3	80.2
2005–06	71.8	72.0	82.4	76.0	81.6	82.4

How Annual Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14 Were Set

This section provides a brief explanation of the general procedure used to set performance objectives through 2013–14. The objectives were set in such a way that baseline data were computed some time in the past and the school/district/state was given a fixed rate of incrementing on a target such that by 2013–14 the target value would be a value that would be possible only if all the students were scoring proficient or advanced. For Options 1 and 2, the targets are percentages and the target in 2013–14 is 100% of students scoring proficient or advanced. For Safe Harbor 2, the target value is an index value of 100, which only occurs when all or 100% of the students scored proficient or advanced.

This process is best illustrated by an example using the elementary and middle schools 2005–06 Safe Harbor 2 target of 71.8 in ELA. The following table provides the 2003–04 baseline and targets through 2013–14.

2003–04 Baseline	Increment	2004–05	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14
64.8	3.5	68.3	71.8	75.3	78.8	82.3	85.8	89.3	92.8	96.3	100

The contents of the table were determined with the following process. Using 2003–04 performance data, all the performance index values were computed for each subgroup. The frequency distribution of these values was examined and the baseline of 64.8 represents a certain threshold value. The fixed rate or increment of 3.5 was calculated from $(100 - 64.8)/10 = 3.5$ because there are 10 school years from 2003–04 until 2013–14. Given that a fixed gain of 3.5 can be achieved every year from the baseline value, then the index should be 100 (all students scoring at least proficient) by 2013–14. The 2004–05 target is $64.8 + 3.5 = 68.3$, the 2005–06 one is $68.3 + 3.5 = 71.8$, and so on. Hence, if the school/district/state's index can steadily increment at the rate of 3.5 (relative to 64.8 baseline in 2003–04) in 10 years, the result would be $64.8 + (10 \times 3.5) = 99.8$, which is rounded off to 100.

Objectives for subsequent years were set so that they increase in approximately equal intervals. Option 1 rises every 3 years and Safe Harbor 2, as shown in the above example, rises each year.

The threshold was determined by calculating the statistic for all schools (or districts), sorting the statistic in descending order, beginning with the school (district) with the lowest value, adding the enrollments until 20% of the State's enrollment had been accounted for, and the value of the statistic for that school (district) became the starting point.

Student Performance

Critical Elements 3.2 (SCAW, pp. 23-25) and 5.2 (SCAW, p. 33)

All students who were enrolled by the 45th day of the school year and through the first day of testing were included in the performance calculations.

If a group met the performance requirement via safe harbor but missed the other indicator objective (attendance rate for elementary/middle schools and graduation rate for high schools) for the group in question, it was reported as performance not met.

For schools that just opened in 2005–06, options that involve 3-year averages or that require data prior to 2005–06 did not apply.

Student Performance Data Used to Compute the Mean Percent of Students Scoring Proficient or Advanced in the Last Three Years

Elementary/Middle Schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary/middle school students in grades 3-8 were included. <p>PACT Data</p> <p>2004 With SEM adjustment</p> <p>2005 With SEM adjustment</p> <p>2006 With SEM adjustment</p> <p>PACT-Alt Data</p> <p>Unadjusted PACT-Alt student performance were used for the said years.</p>
High Schools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High school students who were in high school for two years (NINE GR field = 5) and those who were eligible to take HSAP-Alt (AAE Field = 2) were included. <p>HSAP and HSAP-Alt Data</p> <p>2004 With SEM adjustment</p> <p>2005 With SEM adjustment</p> <p>2006 With SEM adjustment</p>
District/State
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elementary/middle/high school students and the data described above were included.

To satisfy the student performance requirement, each group needs to meet any one of the five options, listed below, in both ELA and math.

(Note: The following are general descriptions that apply to all types of calculations. The reader must be careful to apply the correct objectives as listed in this document’s *Annual Measurable Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14* section and that depend on the type of calculation [elementary/middle school, high school, district, or state] involved.)

Option 1.

The percent of students scoring proficient or advanced in 2006 must meet or exceed the 2005–06 objectives for ELA and math (see this document’s *Annual Measurable Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14* section).

Option 2.

The mean percent of students scoring proficient or advanced for 2004, 2005, and 2006 must meet or exceed the 2005–06 objectives for ELA and math (see this document’s *Annual Measurable Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14* section).

Important Note for Safe Harbors 1-3.

“If a school or district meets AYP by using the safe harbor provision, the subgroup(s) meeting safe harbor also must meet the target for the other indicator. The number of targets is increased accordingly.” See Attachment C, SCAW, pp. 63-64. *That is, if Options 1 and 2 are not met and at least one of Options 3, 4, and 5 are met by the subgroup, that same subgroup for which safe harbor is*

met must also meet the target for the other indicator in order to meet the performance objective. Only the group that meets the performance criterion by safe harbor must meet the target for the other indicator. This policy is not to be confused with what was done in the first year (2002–03) of AYP determinations where if a group used safe harbor, then every group had to meet the target for the other indicator.

Option 3. (Safe Harbor 1)

The percent of students scoring “below proficient” in 2005–06 must decline by at least 10% from the percent in 2004–05. For example, if the percent of students scoring “below proficient” in 2004–05 is 56%, then the percent of students scoring “below proficient” is expected to decline by at least 5.6% in 2005–06 OR equivalently, the percent of students scoring proficient or advanced should INCREASE by 5.6%. That is, the percent of students scoring proficient or advanced in 2004–05 is 44% (100% - 56%) and is expected to be at least 49.6% (44% + 5.6%) in 2005–06.

Option 4. (Safe Harbor 2)

Performance Index (PI) in 2006 must meet or exceed the 2005–06 objectives for ELA and math (see this document’s *Annual Measurable Performance Objectives for Meeting AYP by 2013–14* section). Calculate the PI for each subject separately. (Note: The data used to compute the PI for both years **were** subjected to the 1% students with disabilities adjustment (see this document’s *Students with Disabilities* section).

The following example shows how to calculate the Performance Index (PI):

- a) The PI is a weighted score using the number of students in each of the five performance levels and the corresponding weights.

Performance Levels (Use SEM-adjusted 2006 PACT scores)	N	Weight	Contribution to Weighted Score (N x Weight)
BB1	100	25	2,500
BB2	200	50	10,000
B	100	75	7,500
P	100	100	10,000
A	200	100	20,000
TOTAL	700		50,000

- b) Performance Index (PI) = $50,000/700 = 71.4$

If the subgroup with a 71.4 PI value for ELA is from an elementary school, then the objective is 71.8 in 2005–06. Because 71.4 does not exceed the target, the subgroup does not satisfy the requirements for this option.

Elementary/Middle Schools
For PACT, the students at the below basic (BB) level were divided into below basic 1 (BB1) and below basic 2 (BB2) levels using the cutoff scores determined by the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee. For PACT-Alt, all students in the BB level were treated as students in the BB2 level.
High Schools
HSAP and HSAP-Alt levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 correspond to PACT levels BB, B, P, and A respectively. The below basic level was reclassified into two levels: below basic 1 (BB1) and

below basic 2 (BB2). Students whose scores are more than 2 SEMs below the cutoff score for the basic level are considered BB1. For example, the ELA HSAP cutoff score for the basic level is 200 and IF the SEM is 5.64, then two SEMs is 11.28, which rounds to 11. Therefore, two SEMs below 200 is 189. Raw scores below 189 (188 or lower) are considered BB1.

		Two SEMs	Two SEMs Rounded Off to the Nearest Integer
HSAP	Spring 2005		
	ELA	= 5.64 x 2 = 11.28	11
	Math	= 6.58 x 2 = 13.16	13
	Spring 2006		
	ELA	= 5.38 x 2 = 10.76	11
	Math	= 6.49 x 2 = 12.98	13
HSAP-Alt	2004–05		
	ELA	= 4.27 x 2 = 8.54	9
	Math	= 4.27 x 2 = 8.54	9
	2005–06		
	ELA	= 3.75 x 2 = 7.50	8
	Math	= 4.65 x 2 = 9.30	9

Option 5. (Safe Harbor 3)

The subgroup's actual performance index (PI) gain from 2004–05 to 2005–06 must meet or exceed the subgroup's required PI gain from 2004–05 to 2005–06, which is $(100 - \text{PI in 2004–05})/9$. (The subgroup's actual PI gain is computed by subtracting the subgroup's 2004–05 PI from the subgroup's 2005–06 PI. The required PI gain is computed by subtracting the PI in 2004–05 from 100 and then dividing the difference by 9. The divisor is 9 for the subgroup's required PI gain because it is 9 more years until 2013–14. The computation also implies that in 9 years, the PI index should be 100, which means all students scored proficient or advanced.) (Note: The data for this option were not matched at the student level prior to computing the described performance indexes. The data used to compute the PI for 2005–06 **were** subjected to the 1% students with disabilities adjustment. See the *Students with Disabilities* section below.)

Students with Disabilities

Critical Element 5.3 (SCAW, pp. 34-35)

Students taking off-level tests are counted as NOT TESTED for participation and any scores from such tests will be set to missing and excluded from the performance calculations. Although PACT off-grade-level tests were administered in spring 2006, the change is in anticipation of off-grade-level testing no longer being offered starting in spring 2007. Consequently the adjustment described in the next paragraph this year only applies to students who took PACT-Alt and not, as in last year, to students who took an off-grade-level test in PACT or who took the PACT-Alt.

The total enrollment for grades 3-8 in elementary/middle schools on the first day of testing was computed. If the number of students **who scored proficient or advanced** on an alternative (PACT-Alt) test exceeded 1% of the total enrollment, then such students in excess of the 1% were randomly

selected regardless of which school they were enrolled in and their scores became “below proficient” for AYP purposes. A separate adjustment is made for each subject (ELA and math).

The high school AYP calculations did not have such an adjustment.

Student Participation

Critical Element 10.1 (SCAW, p. 54)

For participation, full-year enrollment is NOT a factor. All students enrolled on the first day of testing must be tested. LEP students were counted for participation in ELA. If they took math, they were counted for participation in math also. However, they were not counted for performance in both ELA and math. In general, ESL students in the first year of enrollment in a school in the United States do not have to take the ELA test, provided that they must have taken ELDA. Students who were excluded through the “not tested” reports are not counted in enrollment.

The denominator for the participation rate is the enrollment in the school/subgroup from the first day of testing data. For elementary and middle schools, the enrollment is the number of students enrolled in grades 3 through 8. For high schools, the enrollment is the number of students in the second year of high school. The numerator for the participation rate is the number of students included in the denominator who have test scores (PACT or PACT-Alt for elementary and middle schools and HSAP or HSAP-Alt for high schools).

Calculate participation rates separately for ELA and math. To satisfy the student participation requirement for a particular subject area, each group used for the school AYP calculation needed to meet one of the two options, listed below.

Option 1.

At least 95% of the targeted population took the Spring 2006 PACT in a particular subject area.

Option 2.

The three-year average of the participation rate is at least 95% in a particular subject area. If only a two-year average was available, then that was used instead of a three-year average.

Group Size

Critical Element 5.2 (SCAW, p. 33)

The minimum group size is 40 in both participation and performance calculations with the exception of the disabled and LEP groups where the minimum group size is 50 for performance calculations only. The number tested was used for performance and the number enrolled was used for participation.

When the *all students* group does not meet the minimum group size, then none of its subgroups can meet the minimum group size. Hence, the minimum group size does not apply to the *all students* group so that any school can be assessed, at the minimum, on the performance and participation objectives.

CAUTION: Many readers have confused the number enrolled (for participation) and the number tested (for performance) with each other. Number ENROLLED pertains to the number of students who were enrolled on the first day of testing regardless of whether or not they were continuously enrolled AND regardless of whether or not they have test scores. This is driven by the fact that all students must be tested at a school regardless of when they enrolled. Number TESTED pertains to the number of students with test scores, who were enrolled on the first day of testing, and who were continuously enrolled. These two numbers are not directly comparable because they do not refer to the same group of students. Many questions about preliminary and final 2004-05 results were due to confusing these two numbers with each other.

Other Indicator: Attendance Rate for Elementary/Middle Schools or Graduation Rate for High Schools

Critical Elements 7.1 (SCAW, pp. 43-45) and 7.2 (SCAW, pp. 46)

A school/district/state needs to meet one of the following to satisfy the requirements for the other indicator for *all students*. (**Important Note:** *If safe harbor is applied, the particular subgroup in question needs to meet its subgroup attendance/graduation rate requirement, as shown below, in order for the subgroup to meet the performance objective.*)

Elementary/Middle Schools
<p>Attendance Rate</p> <p>Option 1. The 2005–06 attendance rate must meet or exceed 94.0%. (Historical Note: Last year the criterion was that the 2004–05 attendance rate must meet or exceed 95.3%.)</p> <p>Option 2. The 2005–06 attendance rate is at least .1 higher than it was in 2004–05. (Historical Note: There is no provision for a three-year mean attendance rate this year. Last year the criterion was that the three-year mean attendance rate must meet or exceed 95.3%.)</p>
High Schools
<p>Graduation Rate</p> <p>Option 1. The 2005–06 graduation rate must meet or exceed 88.3%.</p> <p>Option 2. The 2005–06 graduation rate must meet or exceed the three-year mean graduation rate.</p> <p>Option 3. The 2005–06 graduation rate must meet or exceed the prior year’s (2004–05) rate.</p>
District/State
<p>Attendance and Graduation Rates If the district/state satisfies any single one of the five criteria (2 from attendance and 3 from graduation) listed below, it meets the requirement.</p> <p>Option 1 for Attendance Rates. 1.1 The 2005–06 attendance rate must meet or exceed 94.0%. (Historical Note: Last year the criterion was that the 2004–05 attendance rate must meet or exceed 94.3%,</p>

which was different from the school standard of 95.3%.)

OR

1.2 The 2005–06 attendance rate is at least .1 higher than it was in 2004–05.

(Historical Note: There is **no** provision for a three-year mean attendance rate this year. Last year the criterion was that the three-year mean attendance rate must meet or exceed 94.3%.)

Option 2 for Graduation Rates.

2.1. The 2005–06 graduation rate must meet or exceed 88.3%.

(Note: The school, district, and state standards are the same.)

OR

2.2. The 2005–06 graduation rate must meet or exceed the three-year mean graduation rate.

OR

2.3. The 2005–06 graduation rate must meet or exceed the prior year's (2004–05) graduation rate.

All attendance rates (including total students) will be based on 180th day data. These data were from the 180-day SASI report, which includes demographic categories. The Office of Technology provided the Office of Research a summary file that did not contain student-level records and that was used to obtain the final attendance rates. The attendance rate is the *total days of attendance* divided by the *total days in membership* (i.e., enrollment days). Districts had the flexibility in setting district-specific absence codes in their SASI databases. Between December 2005 and February 2006, districts were allowed to identify codes that indicated attendance for part of a day or participation in a school-sponsored activity. All other absence codes were counted as absences. The attendance rates were computed by excluding pre-kindergarten data.

(Historical Note: The following provide the data processing used in 2004–05. The attendance rate for the *All Students* group was derived from 135-day data. The 135-day average daily membership (ADM) data are provided by the SDE's Office of Finance. The attendance rate is the average daily attendance (ADA) divided by the ADM. The 135-day membership and attendance report was not reported by demographic groups, such as ethnicity, gender, etc. The report only provided disaggregated data according to pupil classification (elementary, secondary, vocational, handicapped) for financial purposes. The attendance rates for all other subgroups was derived from 180-day data. These data were from the 180-day SASI report, which includes demographic categories. The Office of Technology provided the Office of Research a summary file that did not contain student-level records and that was used to obtain the final attendance rates. The attendance rate is the *total days of attendance* divided by the *enrollment days* and included data from all grade levels.)

Minimum Group Size for Reporting and Accountability Purposes

Critical Element 5.5 (SCAW, pp. 39-40)

- Results for groups with fewer than 10 students were not reported. However, the number tested appeared on the reports.
- If there are fewer than 40 students in a school, data were reported for all the students only and not for any groups. Since the school had fewer than 40 students, none of the groups for that school had at least 40 students.

Note Regarding the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) Adjustment

- The classical standard error of measurement (SEM) was rounded off to the nearest integer and then added to the scale score. This adjustment did not apply to PACT-Alt scores.

	Spring 2006 PACT SEMs		Spring 2006 PACT SEMs Rounded Off to the Nearest Integer	
Grade Level	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
1	4.51815	5.60178	5	6
2	4.49362	5.48157	4	5
3	4.00326	4.84785	4	5
4	3.92173	5.35320	4	5
5	4.01267	5.45843	4	5
6	4.22620	4.87792	4	5
7	3.82540	5.01051	4	5
8	3.50670	3.80646	4	4

	Spring 2005 PACT SEMs		Spring 2005 PACT SEMs Rounded Off to the Nearest Integer	
Grade Level	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
1	4.50015	5.61609	5	6
2	4.56225	5.55738	5	6
3	4.03523	5.26021	4	5
4	4.04958	5.40744	4	5
5	4.07134	5.76993	4	6
6	4.28041	5.05968	4	5
7	3.85245	5.30462	4	5
8	3.56068	4.00060	4	4

PACT, HSAP, and HSAP-Alt Scores

PACT ELA Scale Score Cutoff Scores				
Grade	Below Basic 2	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
1	80	91	107	n/a
2	183	194	207	n/a
3	290	296	310	331
4	389	395	410	430
5	488	495	511	531
6	590	596	612	629
7	691	696	712	729
8	792	797	813	827
PACT Math Scale Score Cutoff Scores				
1	83	95	112	n/a
2	183	195	214	n/a
3	290	298	316	326
4	389	399	416	427
5	490	499	517	528
6	591	599	617	628
7	691	700	717	727
8	793	800	818	827

- PACT cutoff scores are fixed, and do not change from year to year and test form to test form.
- Theoretical minimum and maximum PACT scores are $(\text{grade} \times 100) \pm 64$. For a given form, it may not be possible to achieve the theoretical extreme scores.
- n/a - No cut scores were determined for the Advanced level for Grades 1 and 2.

Spring 2005 and Spring 2006 HSAP Cutoff Scores		
	ELA	Math
Advanced (Level 4)	241 or higher	241 or higher
Proficient (Level 3)	223-240	220-240
Basic (Level 2)	200-222	200-219
Below Basic 2 (Level 1)	189-199	187-199
Below Basic 1* (Level 1)	188 or lower	186 or lower

* more than 2 SEMs below the Basic level

HSAP Spring 2005: ELA SEM is 5.64 and Math SEM is 6.58.

HSAP Spring 2006: ELA SEM is 5.38 and Math SEM is 6.49.

	2004–05 HSAP-Alt Cutoff Scores		2005–06 HSAP-Alt Cutoff Scores	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
Advanced	82 or higher	87 or higher	82 or higher	87 or higher
Proficient	56-81	52-86	56-81	52-86
Basic	36-55	36-51	36-55	36-51
Below Basic 2	27-35	27-35	28-35	27-35
Below Basic 1*	26 or lower	26 or lower	27 or lower	26 or lower

* more than 2 SEMs below the Basic level

2004–05: ELA and Math SEM is 4.27. Two SEMs is $4.27 \times 2 = 8.54$, which rounds to 9

2005–06: ELA SEM is 3.75 and Math SEM is 4.65. Two ELA SEMs is $3.75 \times 2 = 7.50$, which rounds to 8. Two Math SEMs is $4.65 \times 2 = 9.3$, which rounds to 9.

Note Regarding PACT Off-Grade Level Testing Determination

- For each subject, the EFA grade level from the first day of testing data was compared to the PACT test grade. If the EFA grade exceeded the PACT test grade, then the test was considered off-grade. No other criteria was involved in making the determination. Furthermore, if the EFA grade was less than the PACT test grade, then that was considered an error in the EFA grade and on-grade testing was assumed.

Note Regarding Rounding Off Numbers

- Once a statistic has been computed, it is rounded off to the first decimal place before the criteria for meeting an option is applied.